

@Kurt,

- you again post some AI's text, when I wrote already that now AIs know only what they learned at reading mainstream publications, first of all when relating to any really fundamental problem, pop-scientific ones; and, if write about some really fundamental problems,

- since, again – see the SS posts above – in mainstream philosophy and sciences, including physics, all really fundamental phenomena/notions, first of all in this case “Matter”, “Consciousness”, “Space”, “Time”, “Energy”, “Information”, **are fundamentally completely transcendent/uncertain/irrational** – so really all “fundamental” mainstream publications really logically inevitably are only some scientifically by no means scientifically rationally substantiated transcendent mental constructions.

So the AIs also write really unscientific transcendent somethings – but seems doesn't suspect that to write about material objects/systems, energy, space, time, etc., it is necessary before to understand really scientifically what that is/are. Besides your AI seems doesn't understand what the notion “proof” means, so for it everything that it learned in the mainstream physics is undoubtedly true. – up to, say, claim

“...Logical vs physical arguments.

- in any real sciences, including physics, **absolutely principally cannot be any contradictions between logical and scientific arguments**. If a contradiction exists, that really means that the scientific arguments are wrong/irrational. And this is independently on – in what science the true logical arguments are formulated, and in what science these argumenta are concretely applied.

Including, say, when the AI writes that physical and philosophical approaches are principally different, and so application of philosophy in physics is quite incorrect, that is completely correct, if relates to mainstream philosophy, which really - since philosophy 2500 years was defined as the science that studies just fundamental phenomena/notions and corresponding problems - attempts to do this till now, but till now really it is a set of numerous theories, doctrines, schools, etc. that are based on fundamentally transcendent beliefs in real existence and real actions of transcendent omnipotent and omniscient “Matter”, “Ideas”, so on, from which numerous mainstream “ontologies” and “epistemologies” of the phenomena/notions above.

Correspondingly all what the AI writes about SS&VT 2007 “The Information as Absolute” conception, is completely incorrect. In the conception **really scientific philosophy** is presented, since it is rigorously logically perfectly substantiated, i.e. **is based** [more see first dozen of pages in <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363645560> The Information as Absolute - 2022 ed]

- on **rigorous proof of existence** of “Information” that exists as some informational patterns/systems of the patterns [IPS] that are elements of the absolutely infinite “Information” Set, which exists absolutely always, having no Beginning and End since absolutely – logically - cannot be non-existent; and

- on **proofs of self and mutual consistence and completeness** of basic points in the conception - “Properties” in the link above. In the conception it isn't proven **uniqueness** - that is impossible since humans consciousnesses are IPSs in the Set and so fundamentally cannot know about anything else, however in this case that is inessential – since everything is observed as something that can be described by some IPSs, follows that this everything is are only IPSs; moreover for the everything existence only as IPSs there is no necessity in anything else..

The set of points –[existence, self-consistence, completeness] above is necessary and sufficient set, the consistence with which rigorously proves truth of a theory, concept, etc., in this case – of the The Information as Absolute” conception, while any/every scientific theory, including physics - besides the purely humans consciences product “mathematics”, where in basic theories the proof of existence is unnecessary this problem is solved by “let A is...”, “let B is...”...,

- however that fundamentally isn't so in mainstream philosophy and natural sciences, including physics,
- and in fundamental contrast to the conception, the physics by no means answer the questions – what is “Matter” - and so “particle”, field, etc., from where, why and how they appeared and exist, etc. so it is fundamentally impossible to prove its – and any mainstream science's – truth. So, again, really all mainstream theories are some transcendent mental constructions that are based on some transcendent postulates;
- when the authors of which even don't suspect that they really study matter only instinctively using information, having at that no any understanding what word “information” means, and so why they equally exchange and analyze IPSs using logical rules [“Logical Rules” is a “Logos” set element] mystically quite equally at communications with each other and with material objects.

The post is long, so now

Cheers

55-11-05-26, page 220

=====

So let's continue,

Correspondingly the AI's “analysis” of SS posts above is a typical set of mainstream really scientifically senseless claims. Say this

“...Logical vs physical arguments.

Your starting claims about “Change”, “Time”, “Energy” and “Inertia” being “logically interlinked” because instant change would be “self-inconsistent” are philosophical assertions, not theorems. In standard physics, time, energy and inertia are connected by well-defined dynamical laws”

- about “Logical vs physical arguments” see previous post; and the SS post earlier, where it is pointed that in mainstream physics really energy and inertia are connected rather strangely – in practically all physics as $E=mc^2$, in Standard Model [really inertial] mass quite also legitimately is created by some strange “Higgs mechanism”, etc..

This

“...“No time dilation” vs established experiments.

You explicitly state that “absolutely for sure there cannot be any time dilations.” That is flatly incompatible with a very large body of precise measurements: atomic clocks on aircraft and satellites, GPS, particle lifetime dilation in accelerators and cosmic rays, et ...”

- again typical mainstream unscientific claim. Really any experimental data fundamentally prove nothing - though it is enough to make one experiment that inconsistent with a theory to prove that the theory is wrong. But, what is more essential, is that in all experimental “confirmations” above

really no any “time dilation” was measured. That is absolutely impossible so for this fundamentally no instruments that could measure the “dilation” can exist. All experiments measured inly slowing of interna processes in concrete material objects, say, in unstable particles, but for any non-mainstream human it is quite evident that the particles aren’t time; etc. To:

“...Discrete informational lattice vs SR/GR.

You postulate a [4+4+1]-dimensional dense lattice of ... That may be an interesting toy model, but to count as physics it needs to show, step by step, how:

Maxwell’s equations and the standard electromagnetic stress–energy tensor emerge in the continuum limit.”, etc.

- again – since the “Logos” element “Change” is logically self-inconsistent any instant – including continues – changes of states of any IPS, including IPS “particle” and system o particles, including positions in space and time, are fundamentally discrete, and at every discrete step of changes the states are uncertain. Just so in Matter the QM scale exists, where, including, Maxwell’s equations aren’t applicable directly.

Etc, though in thus case the FLE lattice discreteness is because FLE has fundamentally [any IPS in the Set fundamentally has] non-zero size.

The post is long, so now

Cheers

11-05-26, page 220

=====

So let’s continue [see SS posts on previous page]; a few comments else. To this,:

“... “Completely scientifically rational assumptions” are still postulates.

You criticize mainstream physics for “transcendent beliefs” but then freely introduce:...”

- again, everything in the SS&VT “IasA” conception and PSIP model is rigorously scientifically rationally grounded, though indeed, is quite really “counterintuitive” for mainstream physicists [and AIs], that really only instinctively study Matter, having no any really scientific understanding about what is Matter - and what they are themselves; , and what is “information” that they instinctively use. So the first step at understanding yhe conception and model is asking himself “What is ‘I’? “What is that I observe around me – and why and how I observe”? What is “information”? that really appears at the observations, and why and how I in some cases adequately to the reality analyze the information?”.

Only after a human understands that the questions above are quite necessary for real analysis of what exists and happens, including in studied by physics matter, and so attempt to answer, he wilkl find the answers in the [only] conception and model above, which so is quite simple - all that is in the questions happens **because that both “I” and everything else are absolutely foir sure some informational patterns/systems, and so there is no any mystics in exchange by some information between.**

And further he will read and understand the conception/model, first of all understanding that what he reads is really rigorously scientific.

Including understand [in the model SS freely introduce] that

“...An absolute informational spacetime....”

- in the model there is, of course, no strange “informational spacetime’, though indeed, the spacetime is of informational system “Matter”; has metrics (at least) $(ct, X, Y, Z, g, w, e, s, ct)$ and is absolute -it is nothing else that **absolutely obligatory actualizations in this system Logos elements “Space” and “Time”** in this IPS as logical possibility for this IPS be existent and change. I.e. the spacetime is only some “empty container”, where $[4+4]D$ space **metrics is determined by $[4+4]$ FLE decrease of freedom** at changing everything in Matter states. Nothing in the spacetime can be changed by everything in Matter that is “constructed” from FLEs, so the space by no means can be “contracted”, “curved”, etc., and the unique universal for all elements in the “Information” Set time absolutely for sure by no means can be “dilated”.

So to

“...A specific dimensionality $[4+4+1]$...”

- why Matter’s space dimension is $[4+4]D$ see the SS posts above here: 4 dimensions relate to utmost universal “kinematical” FLE decreases of freedom at changing its binary states “binary flip”, 3D XYZ are “von Weizsäcker’s” ones, i.e. provide existence of binary logical elements, 4-th ct is “Fredkin-Toffoli’s” one provides reverse flipping, 4 g, w, e, s dimensions relate to decrease of freedom of FLE be marked by one of 4 fundamental Nature Gravitym Weak, Electric and Nuclear/String, forces.

And to:

“...A Planck lattice of reversible FLEs.

A specific pattern of momentum creation in that lattice.

These are simply your postulates. Calling them “completely scientifically rational” doesn’t change their status...”

- again, “kinematical” FLE lattice part in the model is based on the really outstanding and foundational von Weizsäcker’s “Ur hypothesis” that for Matter be based on [primary binary elements [“Urs” [“Ur” in old German in this case means “bit”] it is necessary and sufficient for Matter’s space be 3D and the space **experimentally is 3D**;

- and Fedkin idea that if a system is based on **reversible** binary elements, information in the system changes without energy dissipation, `what Fredkin **experimentally** confirmed in his, say, “billiard balls computers”

The post is long, so now

Cheers

12-05-26, page 221

=====

So let’s continue.

In the last post it is shown that postulated in the model FLE lattice is quite scientifically rational, and **existence of the 4 space dimensions is in accordance with experiment**. So here some note to the 4 g, w, e, s dimensions - and to

“...Where are the predictions that distinguish your model?”

You mention deriving values of $[G]$, $[\alpha]$, and the strong coupling, and “clarifying” issues at the QM/Planck scale. Concretely:

What numerical values do you obtain for those constants, and with what error bars?”

- in the model fundamental Forces **charges are sections of FLEs in particles [particles are] algorithms** that run at particles constant and always motion in the lattice [so in 4D space] of “FLE-by-FLE sequentially flipping point”, which at their flipping constantly and always radiate the Forces mediators. Mediators – as particles – are also only specific disturbances in the lattice, but **in fundamental contrast to particles don’t contain/carry energies and “kinematical” momentums**. So, say, since intensive flows of mediators compose classical Forces fields, the fields don’t contain energy - in fundamental contrast to standard physics, where the fields [in QFTs – flows of “virtual” particles-mediators] by some mystic way contain/carry energy and momentums, what evidently for any non-mainstream human violate the energy conservation law [see also the attached post on 197 page PDF].

At that in the initial PSIP models of Gravity, Electric, and Nuclear/Strong Forces it is shown that the Forces act inn Matter by the same scheme At that and the Coulomb and Newtonian gravity laws are derived, so in the models derived numerical values constants have the same error bars as have in standard physics.

As well as the derived the Nuclear/Strong Force strength value is in accordance with experiment, i.e. Electric: Nuclear/Strong Forces ratio is $\sim 1:100$. Taking into account Gravity Forces derived strength value gives experimentally measured ratio, say, for 2 protons, $G:E:S$ ratio is $1.2 \times 10^{-36} : 1:100$.

This ratio is possible in the model only if FLE size and flip time are Planck length and Panck time, what experimentally confirms what is postulated for the FLE lattice,

Etc., the PSIP model in near 30 cases fundamentally distinguishes from standard physics, in all cases in that the model rigorously scientifically clarifies really ad hic fundamentally transcendent postulates, tenets, etc. in the standard physics; and, at that, all in the model is rigorously scientifically grounded and is in whole accordance with all reliable experimental data.

Corespobdingly really the AI analysis is in most cases questionable; though thus ca be since the AI didn’t read the ‘IasA’ conception an PSIP model papers - any mentions about the conception and model in mainstream scientific and po-scientific publications are prohibited and so the AI don’t know about their existence, including what looks from its analysis it possibly cannot read linked in SS posts RG publications

So point here well accessible links: the "The Information as Absolute" conception - <https://arxiv.org/abs/1004.3712> it is enogh to read first dozen of pagesd; first main PSOP paper - <https://arxiv.org/abs/0707.4657> in the paper section 2.9 “Mediation of the forces in complex systems” can be passed since more comprehensively version is in section 6. “Mediation of the fundamental forces in complex systems” in other paper below

<https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202110.0453/v6>

Cheers

12-05-26, page 221

=====

So let’s continue about PDSIP model accordance with experimental data [not, of course, urs standard “experimental confirmations”, though confirmations is principally possible only in the

“IasA” conception, which, of course, is based on experimental observation of some IPS, but this is enough to make any one experiment to derive rigorous proof of the conception] in PSIP model:

- it is rigorously proven that there cannot be deterministic instant changes, and so on some level states of changing somethings are uncertain – what **experimentally** is observed on QM scale, but this fact has no any scientific explanation in standard physics [SP],

- in accordance with all **experimental data** scientifically defined what are “energy” and “inertia”, so, say, this is quite in non-accordance with “experimental confirmation of Higgs mechanism” in SP, etc.;

- it is explained completely mystic in SP **experimental** fact that on QM scale particles, atoms, etc. , are identical – on;y copies of concrete IPS are identical [Property I7], and so given type particles are copies [of corresponding binary algorithms];

- it is proposed quite rigorously scientifically rational models of particles/algorithms that run in the “kinematical” [5]4D FLE-lattice/spacetime [more see SS posts above], what clarifies what is the quite mystic in SP **experimentally observed** “wave-particle duality”, what is **experimentally observed** really mystic in SP “spin” – all fundamental particles have some 4D angular momentum equal \hbar , however, since 4D AM as the vector product, which mathematically doesn’t exist as a vector,

- the restmassless particles that are created by 3DXYZ momentums [photons] have spin \hbar , that has only $\pm \hbar$ projections; having rest mass particles 4D AMs are observed **experimentally** in 3D spaced as $\hbar/2$; from what follows prediction in the model that fermions “neutrinos” have rest masses, what is, though till now not directly, **experimentally** observed in SP;

- the model’s [mostly 4+4+1]D particles exist, move, and interact, first of all in 4D τ, X, Y, Z “kinematical” space of Matte’s absolute, and **fundamentally really/observably Cartesian** spacetime that has metrics (at least) $(\tau, X, Y, Z, g, w, e, s, ct)$, while in SP the spacetime is 4D Minkowski space that has metrics (ict, X, Y, Z) , where real, and really space, τ -dimension is [at that quite mystically mathematically imaginary] the time dimension. Correspondingly in SP/SR antiparticles, that are well **experimentally** observed, don’t exist, since really are created by negatively [oppositely to that create particles] directed in τ -dimension momentums. However this real, completely rigorously substantiated in the model fact, reveals itself implicitly in scalar Hamiltonian, so formally “ \pm ” for it is mathematically correct – so by suggesting mystic “sea of negative energies” Dirac obtained solution that were further experimentally observed as antiparticles. Besides in QFTs it is again quite mystically postulated that antiparticles “move back in time”, what really absolutely impossible.

The model – as in many cases SP - is in full accordance with experiments, however in fundamental contrast to SP not mystically but rigorously scientifically.

L.D. Edmonds, this yours stubbornly a number of times repeated

“...Sergey Shevchenko : You still haven't listed the equations! Because you can't! Literature based on mainstream science gives equations for calibrating clocks on GPS satellites....etc.”,

- is correspondingly, and completely, answered a next time in SS post page 218, 5 days ago now, including in the post corresponding link to section 6.2.1 in <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/395113364> Planck scale informational physical model and fundamental problems in physics], is given. If you didn’t understand what you read, that is only your education problem. At that you post in RG threads rather, if too, vividly, what looks

mostly as a spam; and immediately after SS posts, what replaces in RG Home feed “Scientific Topics” sections, where last posts in threads are indicated, scientific SS posts by your aggressive trash.

Etc. As a rule so I don’t communicate in such cases - that only doubles the spam, so your posts by me aren’t commented – and will not be commented – is quite natural.

The post is long, so now

Cheers

13-05-26, page 221